



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,359	03/05/2002	Hidemasa Tokieda	K-2033	7112

32628 7590 03/15/2006

KANESAKA BERNER AND PARTNERS LLP  
SUITE 300, 1700 DIAGONAL RD  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848

EXAMINER

SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/070,359

Applicant(s)

TOKIEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas E. Shortledge

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12 and 20-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,5,6,21 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,7-12, and 22-29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to Remarks filed 11/21/2005.
2. Claims 3-12 and 20-30 are pending. Claims 3, 20 and 21 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 13-19 have been canceled. Claims 3, 5-8, 12, and 20 have been amended. Claims 21-30 have been added.
3. The objections to claims 6-8 have been withdrawn in accordance with the applicants' amendments.
4. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn in accordance with the applicants' amendments.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 4, 7, 8-12, 22 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claim 20 is allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As to claim 20, Lakritz (the closest prior art of record) teaches a document localization management and delivery system for computer applications. With a user

interface for facilitating the localization of documents, data streams, and non-text files for multilingual Internet Web sites, enabling the Web site manager to incrementally update the language content of a Web site or document, using a template based approach and a translation resource. Lakritz does not teach a process of converting language data contained in image data from a text form into a binary form and replacing the text-form data with the binary-form data, a process of giving a page record and a text record as contents information for processing each page in a multilingual processing database, nor a process of judging whether or not characters to be obtained after translation can be accommodated in a storage area of the maximum number of characters through computing the number of characters after translation relative to the number of characters of a language before translation.

As to claim 4, Lakritz does not teach nor fairly suggest a method for performing multilingual translation through a communication network according to claim 3, wherein said language data contained in said image data is converted from a text form into a binary form for replacing the text-form data with the binary-form data.

As to claims 7 and 22, Lakritz does not teach nor fairly suggest a method for performing multilingual translation through a communication network according to claim wherein said page source language record comprises:

- a page ID: a symbol number being unique to each page,

- a language ID: a symbol number defined for each language,

a page address: URL of a home page,  
a date of generation: a date at which the page was generated,  
a generator a symbol number of a person who newly generated the page,  
a date of update: a date at which the page was updated last,  
an updater ID; a symbol number of a person who updated the page last,  
a customer ID: a symbol number assigned to each customer,  
a received order ID: a symbol number determined on reception of an order, and  
HTML: a page source text in the form of HTML.

As to claim 8, Lakritz does not teach nor fairly suggest a method for performing multilingual translation through a communication network according to claim 6, wherein said text source language record comprises:

a text ID: a symbol number which is unique to each text and is the same in any language,  
a language ID: a symbol number defined for each language,  
maximum number of characters: the characters capable of being displayed,  
the number of characters: the number of characters actually displayed,  
a character string: a character string in itself, and  
a translator ID: a symbol number determined for each translator.

As to claim 9, Lakritz does not teach nor fairly suggest a method for performing multilingual translation through a communication network according to claim 6, further

comprising steps of determining in advance a ratio of number of smallest legible font characters to number of characters being displayed on a screen for each language, and associating maximum number of characters of a text data record with a symbol number defined for each language by means of this ratio.

As to claim 12, Lakritz does not teach nor fairly suggest said web site comprising one apparatus and one translation processing system performs a multilingual translation process and its maintenance process and as said multilingual translation process, generates master contents by means of a template, next translates language data of the master contents, repeats these generation and translation processes, stores the language data together with control information into a multilingual processing database, further converts the language data into HTML data and writes them into the master contents on request, and as said maintenance process, monitors change of the master contents, automatically selects a language data file needing to be translated, translates the language data, repeats these monitor, automatic selection and translation processes for necessary language, and reenters the translated language data into the multilingual processing database.

As to claim 29, Lakritz does not teach nor fairly suggest a multilingual translation system according to claim 21, wherein the multilingual translation Web site apparatus further includes a net-bank apparatus to perform a settlement of translation fees

Art Unit: 2654

between the multilingual translation Web site apparatus and the translation requester apparatus.

Claims 10, 11 and 23-28 would also be allowable since they depend from indicated allowable subject matter.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3, 5, 6, 21 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (6,623,529).

As to claim 3, Lakritz teaches:

a step of receiving language data of a subject of translation (receiving a webpage to translate col. 5, lines 10-17);

a step of changing its processing form adaptively to a language of the subject of translation requested (when adding a language translation of a to be translated

Art Unit: 2654

document, the processing means is adaptively changed to translate the document into the target language, based on the target language, col. 5, lines 27-35);

a step of automatically selecting language data for translation (parsing a HTML document, and the translatable material is translated, col. 7, lines 21-30);

a step of performing translation (translating an HTML document, col. 7, lines 21-30);

a step of entering the translated data into a multilingual processing database (entering the translations into a translation queue, col. 10, lines 35-38);

a step of automatically changing the processing form of translation adaptively to a language after translation (once translated the appropriate localized content is delivered in the correct language, col. 4, lines 3-15);

a step of enabling a requester side to receive the translated data (displaying the webpage to the visitor, col. 3, lines 62-67);

wherein said step of automatically selecting language data for translation generates language data and being non-language data, in master contents by means of a template (using a template-based approach to dynamically create documents tailored for a specific language or country, where the country and language-specific information is removed from the document and replaced with tags, and translated (col. 6, line 50 through col. 7, line 10). Where the language-specific information means any static text that is present in the file (col. 40, lines 46-55).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach image data being non-language data. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that



Art Unit: 2654

since Lakritz teaches the template-based approach is able to find language-specific information, the language-specific information means any static text, and since image data would not be static text (separated within a HTML document by a specific tag), Therefore, the image data would be generate as being non-language data, and non-translatable.

As to claim 5, Lakritz teaches the step of performing translation is at least one of an automatic machine translation and a manual input translation (a machine translation and a human translation process, col. 13, lines 54-65).

As to claim 6, Lakritz teaches a page source language record and a text source language record as contents information for processing each page are given in said multilinguagel processing database (col. 18, lines 1-4).

As to claim 21, Lakritz teaches:

a translation requester apparatus (4) for transmitting the translation request via the communication network (1), a multilingual translation Web site apparatus (2) for receiving the translation request and intermediate for the translation, and a plurality of translator apparatuses (3) for translating the subject into the other languages (a translation apparatus for transmitting a localized web page to a visitor, where a request is received and a localized website is produced, where a plurality of translation resources are available, col. 3, line 62 through col. 4, line 2, and col. 12, lines 35-40);

means for converting the subject into an HTML data format and for storing the HTML data together with page source language records and text source language records assigned to the subject as master contents in a database (17) (parsing a HTML document, and the translatable material is translated, (col. 7, lines 21-30) where the page source and text source records are stored, col. 18, lines 1-4);

means for extracting automatically plural parts of text to be translated and excepting non-language parts in the master contents of the subject stored in the database (17) (using a template-based approach to dynamically create documents tailored for a specific language or country, where the country and language-specific information is removed from the document and replaced with tags, and translated (col. 6, line 50 through col. 7, line 10). Where the language-specific information means any static text that is present in the file (col. 40, lines 46-55). Where it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that since the template-based approach is able to find language-specific information, the language-specific information means any static text, and since image data would not be static text (separated within a HTML document by a specific tag), the image data would be generate as being non-language data, and non-translatable).

means for transmitting the plural parts of the text together with the page source language records and text source language records to a plurality of the translator apparatuses (3) (using multiple translators to translate the document, col. 12 lines 29-39);

means for receiving translated text of the subject from a plurality of the translator apparatuses (3) and for assembling the translated text of the subject into translation results for each language and storing them as multilingual contents in the data base (17) according to the page source language records and text source language records assigned to the subject (once the translation resource has finished its processing, the packet which contains the word completed by the translation resource flows back through the adaptor where it is re-converted back into the Pipeline's internal format, col. 13, lines 44-49); and

means for providing the multilingual contents to the translation requester apparatus (4) (outputting the webpage to the visitor, col. 3, lines 62-67).

As to claim 30, Lakritz teaches the communication network (1) is selected from the group consisting of a public wire communication network, a public radio communication network, a non-public wire communication network, and a non-public radio communication network under a TCP/IP environment (an internet environment, col. 3, lines 25-35).

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Art Unit: 2654

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS  
3/01/2006

  
RICHMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE